REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's confirmation of receipt of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) for the German Patent Application 198 36 956.5, filed August 14, 1998.

Additionally, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the International Patent Application PCT/DE99/02388, filed August 2, 1999.

Claims 1-16 are now in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 11 have been amended. Claims 12-16 have been added. No new matter is believed to have been added.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-11 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

More specifically, the Examiner states that the claims are allegedly, "generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and

are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors."

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants counsel has reviewed the claims in question and believes that the amended claims are clearly written in idiomatic English. It is believed that the terms in question, although not specifically pointed out by the Examiner in the above-mentioned Office Action, have been amended or are used consistently throughout the claims and specification. As a result, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out the "grammatical and idiomatic errors" in the claims or contact applicant's counsel to obtain verbal clarification on terms with which the Examiner may be unfamiliar.

In regard to claim 1, the above-identified Office Action states that the limitation "basing a clock frequency . . . on a quartz frequency of the same quartz" is allegedly incomprehensible. Applicant has amended claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner's recommendation to clarify that the quartz frequency is derived from a clock quartz. The oscillator O1 uses the sinusoidal oscillations generated by the clock quartz to generate a clock signal with a frequency that matches the quartz frequency. This clock signal with a frequency f1 is then fed directly or indirectly after clock

conditioning, clock multiplication or clock division to the real-time clock U in FIG. 1 of the instant application.

In rejecting claims 2, 4, and 5 the Examiner requests that the term "times" be restated in more acceptable common art terminology. More specifically, "first times" in claim 2, "second times" in claim 4, and "fourth times" in claim 5. The Examiner also requests that the term "second times" be clarified and described in terms of its relationship to clockless in claim 4. Applicant has amended these claims to include operational time periods that may be associated with each operational state. Exemplary operational states are included in FIG. 2 in the instant application.

Support for these changes may be found on pages 6-10 of the specification of the instant application.

It is accordingly believed that the specification and the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for clarification or cosmetic reasons. The changes are neither provided for overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claim for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

New claims 12-16 provide further clarification by describing a method for conserving power using a clock supply system that is driven according to a usage factor. Thus individual components of the system are able to reduce their power consumption by receiving a lower clock frequency. The clock frequency is selected as a function of processor load.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-16 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Any extension fee associated therewith should be charged to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 09/783,515
Amdt. Dated March 15, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2003

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Kyle H. Flindt
Reg. No. 42,539

For Applicant

KHF:cgm

March 15, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101